Hindawi Journal of Tropical Medicine Volume 2022, Article ID 4792280, 9 pages https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/4792280



Research Article

Risk Factors of Noncompliance to Preventive Mass Drug Administration for Eliminating Lymphatic Filariasis: A Case-Control Study in Jawi District, Northwest Ethiopia

Fetene Mihretu,¹ Gebeyehu Tsega,² Melesse Belayneh ,² and Mesafint Molla Adane ,

Correspondence should be addressed to Mesafint Molla Adane; mesafint.molla@bdu.edu.et

Received 15 July 2022; Accepted 6 September 2022; Published 21 September 2022

Academic Editor: Pedro P. Chieffi

Copyright © 2022 Fetene Mihretu et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Background. High compliance is crucial for the success of a mass drug administration program to achieve lymphatic filariasis elimination. However, the presence of persistently noncompliant individuals might delay the elimination target. Besides, although context-based research is essential to designing effective strategies, only a few studies have focused on identifying factors that play a role in noncompliance with mass drug administration in Africa. Therefore, this study was conducted to identify the factors associated with noncompliance to prevent mass drug administration using ivermectin-with-albendazole for the elimination of lymphatic filariasis in Northwest Ethiopia. Methods. A case-control study was conducted in Jawi District, Northwest Ethiopia. All individuals who are permanently living in the study area and registered on the annual chemotherapy registration book since 2015 were included in this study. A two-proportion formula was used to estimate the required sample size and 348 cases and 348 controls were selected by identification number on the village chemotherapy registration book using a systematic sampling technique. Data were collected by face-to-face interviews using a structured questionnaire developed through an intensive literature review. Then, data were entered and cleaned by using the EPI DATA software, and analyses were conducted using SPSS version 26. Finally, a logistic regression analysis technique was applied to identify the risk factors using adjusted odds ratio as measures of effect. Results. A total of 690 (99.1%) participants, 345 cases and 345 controls, were included in the study. Younger age (AOR = 1.60; 95%CI: 1.10, 2.33), female sex (AOR = 1.56; 95%CI: 1.24, 3.93), thought of not being susceptible to the disease (AOR = 2.36, 95%CI: 1.80, 4.32), lack of disease knowledge (AOR = 1.88; 95% CI: 1.38, 3.81), fear of drug side effect (AOR = 2.45; 95% CI:1.23, 4.86), and not participating in community drug distributors selection (AOR = 2.58; 95% CI: 1.70, 3.91) were found to be the risk factors significantly associated with noncompliance. Conclusion. Noncompliance with lymphatic filariasis mass drug administration therapy was associated with specific demographic, individual, program, and drug delivery characteristics. This finding has important implications for program effectiveness and would be used to accelerate the elimination of lymphatic filariasis in the study area and other endemic settings.

1. Introduction

Lymphatic filariasis (LF) infection, commonly known as elephantiasis, is caused by the transmission of the nematode parasites [1, 2] to humans through mosquito bites [3, 4]. It is

one of the most debilitating diseases in the world [5], including in Ethiopia [6], that can result in death and disability [7] with high loss of productivity, stigma, and treatment cost [4, 8]. LF is a chronic disease with devastating physical, mental, and socio-economic impacts on the affected

¹Carter Center Ethiopia, Bahir Dar Regional Project Office, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia

²Department of Health Systems Management and Health Economics, School of Public Health, College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia

³Department of Environmental Health, School of Public Health, College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia

individuals [9] and is one of the primary causes of long-term disability [10] with severe effects on the quality of life among Ethiopian families [11]. It is estimated to cause a disease burden of 1.74 million disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) [12], with 51 million people infected worldwide as of 2018 [13].

In Ethiopia, about 35 million people live in endemic areas with a nationwide LF prevalence of 6.2% [14], ranging from 2.8% to 7.4% in different regions of the country [15]. The contemporary strategies to eliminate LF mostly rely on mass drug administration (MDA) which involves giving ivermectin-with-albendazole [16, 17] to the entire population at risk [18]. In recognition of its elimination potential, the Global Program to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis (GPELF) was launched by the World Health Organization (WHO) to achieve global elimination by 2030 as a new target year for the elimination of LF as a public health problem [19]. This elimination strategy promoted by GPELF comprises an annual MDA to alleviate the suffering of affected individuals through interrupting transmission, managing morbidity, and preventing disability [4]. Since the commencement of the elimination strategy in 2000, more than 8.6 billion cumulative treatments have been delivered to limit the spread of LF [13]. Nevertheless, the MDA program should cover at least 80% of the individuals at risk to attain the elimination of LF [16], and the elimination objective can be achieved only if issues of drug distribution and implementation challenges are addressed [18].

In Ethiopia, preventive MDA for LF was started in 2009 by community drug distributors (CDDs) [20], and more than 10 rounds of treatments have been administered so far [21]. However, many districts did not achieve the elimination target of 2020 [21], with millions of Ethiopians living in endemic areas [22]. Also, despite the ongoing MDA intervention over a long time, there have been reports of persistent LF transmission in Africa [23, 24] and Ethiopia [21, 22, 25]. Previous mapping studies conducted in different districts of Ethiopia reported a prevalence of 3.7% with high geographical clustering ranging from 0% to more than 50%, and the treatment coverage was reported to be about 81% in 2019 [26]. In particular, the Jawi district remains a hyperendemic area in Ethiopia that failed to meet the WHO critical threshold (Ag <2% and/or MF <1%) for disease elimination after several rounds [21].

Although high coverage and compliance are crucial for the success of an MDA program to achieve elimination [27], the presence of persistently noncompliant individuals (i.e., individuals who commonly missed MDA treatment rounds [28]) might delay the elimination of LF [29]. Also, the effectiveness of this intervention in Africa [30] and Ethiopia [31] is often hampered by several factors. Hence, the high nationwide prevalence [14, 15], the failure to eliminate [21, 25, 32], and the persistent transmission of LF in Ethiopia after a decade of MDA [21, 22, 25], might be linked to the high MDA noncompliance [27]. Furthermore, although context-based research finding is essential to designing effective preventive MDA program strategies [30, 33], only a few studies have focused on identifying factors that play a role in noncompliance to prevent MDA in Africa [30, 31].

Therefore, the current study was conducted to identify the factors associated with noncompliance with preventive MDA of ivermectin-with-albendazole for the elimination of lymphatic filariasis in Northwest Ethiopia. It is hoped that the study will provide a piece of scientific evidence for policymakers, donors, program planners, and implementers about factors associated with noncompliance which can be used to strengthen the MDA program and speed up the elimination of the disease in Ethiopia and other similar settings.

2. Methods and Materials

2.1. Study Design, Area, and Population. A case-control study was conducted in March 2021. The study area, Jawi district, is located 400 km away from Addis Ababa in Northwest Ethiopia and 150 Km from Bahir Dar city. A total of 146378 (with a male to female ratio of 0.55 to 0.45) population lives in the district within 32528 households. The district has one hospital, six health centers, and 27 health posts. Despite the continuing MDA chemotherapy of ivermectin-with-albendazole for the elimination of LF, the district is still an endemic area for LF with a high prevalence [21].

2.2. Inclusion Criteria. All individuals who are permanently living in the study area and have been registered in the annual preventive MDA chemotherapy registration book since 2015 were included in this study. Only individuals with no treatment record in any round due to emigration and individuals who came to the district after the induction of the first preventive MDA chemotherapy were excluded from the study.

2.3. Variables Data Sources and Methods of Assessment. This study characterizes cases or noncompliants to LF preventive chemotherapy as individuals who missed at least one dose of the annual preventive MDA chemotherapy of ivermectin-with-albendazole for the elimination of LF since 2015 [34]. Whereas, compliants (controls) were characterized as individuals who took all five rounds of the preventive MDA chemotherapy within the parallel period. The potential predictor variables were broadly categorized into demographic, individual, program, and drug delivery characteristics. The specific predictor variables were assessed through face-to-face interviews with cases and controls by data collectors using questionnaires.

2.4. Sample Size Determination. A two-proportion formula (EPI info 7, SATCALC) was used to estimate the sample size required for the study with statistical assumptions of 95% confidence level, a power of 80%, a 1:1 ratio of cases and controls, a design effect of 2, a 10% nonresponse rate in both groups, and an OR of 2 to be detected by taking a risk factor of participation in the selection of community drug distributors (CDDs) from an ivermectin treatment adherence study conducted in South Ethiopia with a prevalence of

71.1% and 56% for cases and controls, respectively [34]. Thus, the estimated total sample size was 696 (348 cases and 348 controls).

- 2.5. Sampling Procedure. A multistage random sampling procedure was employed. In the first stage, about 20% of sample villages were selected randomly by lottery method in the district. In the second stage, all eligible cases and controls were listed separately on two different sampling frames from each village's annual preventive MDA chemotherapy registration book. The estimated total sample size was allocated to each village using a probability proportional to size. Then, 348 cases and 348 controls were selected by identification number on the village preventive MDA chemotherapy registration book using a systematic sampling technique.
- 2.6. Data Collection Instruments. Data were collected through face-to-face interviews using a structured questionnaire developed through an intensive literature review. The questionnaire included questions on demographic characteristics (such as age, gender, religion, education, marital status, occupation, and wealth index), individual characteristics such as area of residence, duration of stay in the endemic area, perceived health risk of LF, knowledge of LF, and utilization of long-lasting insecticide-treated net (LLITN), as well as program and drug delivery characteristics (such as participation in the community drug distributor selection, preferred mode of drug delivery, preferred drug dispenser, fear of drug side effects, and perceived capacity of CDDs to distribute drugs).
- 2.7. Data Management and Analysis. Data were entered and cleaned by using the EPI DATA software and analyses were conducted using SPSS Version 26. Each variable was analyzed with the noncompliance of LF treatment in bivariate analysis and those variables with a P value <0.2 in bivariate analysis were entered into multivariate stepwise backward logistic regression analysis. Then, the model was tested by the Hosmer and Lemeshow test and it was found to be a good fit model (P = 0.52). Finally, a logistic regression analysis method was applied to identify the risk factors, using adjusted odds ratios as measures of effect.
- 2.8. Data Quality Assurance. To keep the quality of the data, a standard structured questionnaire was developed in English and translated into Amharic and then back to English to maintain its consistency for actual data collection purposes. One-day training for data collectors and supervisors was conducted by the principal investigator on how to interview and fill out the questionnaire. Data were collected by experienced data collectors who have bachelor's degrees and above in statistics and health. Two individuals with a Master's degree in Public Health background were assigned as supervisors after they had received the necessary training from the principal investigator. Before the actual data collection, the data collection questionnaire was pretested in the nearby district which was not part of the present study area,

and the feedback obtained from the pretest was used to correct some unclear ideas and statements. Data coding, data entry, and cleaning were performed to maintain its quality.

3. Results

- 3.1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants. A total of 690 participants, 345 cases, and 345 controls, were interviewed, making the response rate 99.1% from the initial selection. The mean age of the respondents was 33.25 years (±SD, 13.39). About 57.7% of respondents were female with 223 (64.6%) cases and 175 (50.7%) controls (Table 1).
- 3.2. Individual, Program, and Drug Delivery Characteristics. Among most of the participants, 81.7% cases and 88.7% controls, have perceived LF as a health problem, and nearly half of the respondents166 (48.1%) cases and 214 (62%) controls had knowledge about the symptoms, transmission, and prevention mechanisms of LF (Table 2).

The majority of respondents 259 (75.1%) cases and 270 (78.3%) controls, have LLITN in their homes and most of them use it. Among the noncompliance individuals for treatment, 4 (1.2%), 17 (4.9%), 44 (12.8%), 134 (38.8%), and 146 (42.3%) of them missed five, four, three, two, and one round of treatments, respectively, out of 5 MDA rounds since 2015. Nearly half of the respondents would like to take drugs at their home, and the majority of the respondents 283 (82) cases and 205 (74.2%) cases had not participated in CDD selection (Table 2).

3.3. Factors Associated with Noncompliance to Preventive MDA for the Elimination of Lymphatic Filariasis. An adjusted logistic regression model was developed to identify the factors of noncompliance and prevent MDA. As a result, younger age (AOR = 1.60; 95%CI: 1.10, 2.33), female sex (AOR = 1.56; 95%CI: 1.24, 3.93), thought of not being susceptible to LF (AOR = 2.36, 95%CI: 1.80, 4.32), lack of disease knowledge (AOR = 1.88; 95% CI: 1.38, 3.81), not using long-lasting insecticide-treated nets (AOR = 2.13; 95% CI: 1.18, 3.83), fear of drug side effects (AOR = 2.45; 95% CI: 1.23, 4.86), and not participating in community drug distributors (CDDs) selection (AOR = 2.58; 95%CI:1.70, 3.91) were found to be the factors significantly associated with noncompliance to preventive MDA using ivermectin-withalbendazole for the elimination of lymphatic filariasis in Northwest Ethiopia (Table 3). On the other hand, variables such as duration of stay in the endemic area and preferred mode of drug delivery did not show any significant association with noncompliance (Table 3).

4. Discussions

Although improving treatment compliance with MDA programs is the key to reaching the goal of interrupting LF transmission [18], the presence of persistently noncompliant individuals may delay the elimination of LF [29]. This study has identified important factors contributing to preventive MDA noncompliance in the study area. Hence, younger age

V	ariables	Cases $n = 345$	Control $n = 345$
	<30	206 (59.7)	162 (47)
Age	≥30	139 (40.3)	183 (53)
Condon	Male	122 (35.4)	170 (49.3)
Gender	Female	223 (64.6)	175 (50.7)
Daligion	Orthodox	323 (93.6)	325 (94.2)
Religion	Muslim	22 (6.4)	20 (5.8)
	Do not read and write	193 (55.9)	199 (57.7)
Completed educational level	Read and write only	62 (18)	53 (15.4)
Completed educational level	Primary school (grades 1-8)	45 (13)	45 (13)
	Secondary and above (≥grade 9)	45 (13)	48 (13.9)
Marital status	Married	237 (68.7)	243 (70.4)
Maritar status	Unmarried	108 (31.3)	102 (29.6)
	Farmers	215 (62.3)	215 (62.3)
Occumation	Employed	49 (48.5)	52 (51.5)
Occupation	Unemployed	39 (56.5)	30 (43.5)
	Student	42 (46.7)	48 (53.3)
Gender of household head	Male	293 (84.9)	297 (86.1)
	Female	52 (5.1)	48 (3.9)
	Poor	144 (41.7)	138 (40)
Wealth index	Medium	102 (29.6)	87 (25.2
	Rich	99 (28.7)	120 (34.8)

Table 1: Distribution of respondents by demographic characteristics, Jawi District, Northwest Ethiopia, June 2021 (n = 690).

was found more likely to be noncompliant than older age with an estimated AOR of 1.60 (95%CI: 1.10, 2.33). This finding is similar to the study conducted in Tanzania where increasing age was positively associated with noncompliance to LF preventive MDA [35]. This might be due to the fact that as age increases, the health-seeking behavior of an individual increases, thereby improving the person's compliance with MDA treatments.

In the current study, the risk of noncompliance with preventive MDA was found to be more among female clients than among the associated male clients with an estimated AOR of 1.56 (95% CI: 1.24–3.93). The result is consistent with the study conducted in London and Indonesia [36, 37] but different from the study conducted in Tanzania which reported no major difference between females (54.9%) and males (55.8%) [35]. The possible reasons might be that women are usually busy with their domestic duties and might be prohibited by their husbands from participating in MDA because of their husbands' negative beliefs about the drug [33].

In this study, the thought of not being susceptible to the disease was found to be one of the essential factors significantly associated with noncompliance with preventive MDA with an estimated AOR of 2.36 (95%CI: 1.80, 4.32). Likewise, the thought of not being susceptible to LF was significantly associated with noncompliance with MDA in Ghana [AOR = 2.83, 95%CI: 1.15, 6.98] [38]. Therefore, addressing the issue of noncompliance through health education to increase risk perception may be necessary [31].

Clients' knowledge status of LF disease also showed a significant association with noncompliance with preventive MDA. Respondents who had no adequate knowledge about the symptoms, transmission, and prevention of the disease were found to be more noncompliant (AOR = 1.88; 95% CI:

1.38, 3.81) than those who had better knowledge of the disease which is in agreement with the study conducted in London, Ghana, Sir Lanka, and the Philippines [36, 39–41]. A similar study conducted in the Philippines revealed that disease knowledge was highly associated with MDA acceptance (P = 0.002). Other pieces of literature also reported that lack of disease knowledge was identified as a factor in preventive MDA noncompliance in Ghana [30, 40, 42].

Fear of drug side effects was another predictor of noncompliance in this study. Hence, those clients who reported fear of drug side effects were more likely to be noncompliant with the MDA treatment (AOR = 2.45, 95% CI: 1.23–4.86) than those who did not report fear of drug side effects. Likewise, various studies conducted in different countries showed that the experience of side effects was a predictor variable for noncompliance with MDA treatment. A study conducted in, Ghana, Brazil, India, and Kenya showed that noncompliance was mostly associated with fear of side effects during MDA [30, 40, 43, 44].

As to the participation status in the CDD selection, clients who did not participate in CDD selection were more likely to be noncompliant with MDA (AOR = 2.58; 95% CI: 1.70, 3.91) than those who had participated in CDD selection. A study conducted in Ghana showed that community involvement in the precampaign activities had improved treatment coverage and drug compliance [30]. Similar studies conducted in Ethiopia showed that MDA compliance was influenced by the participation of community members in selecting drug distributors. Those who were involved in the selection of CDDs were more likely to comply with ivermectin treatment as compared to those who did not [34]. The possible explanation might be that participation in the precampaign activities provides an opportunity for improving awareness, building trust, and

Table 2: Distribution of participants by personal and health provider characteristics, Jawi District, Northwest Ethiopia, June 2021 (*n* = 690).

Variables		Cases $n = 345$	Control $n = 345$
Area of residence	Rural	245 (71)	239 (69.3)
Area of residence	Urban	100 (29)	106 (30.7)
Duration of stay in endemic the area	<16 years	206 (59.7)	197 (57.1)
Duration of stay in chacine the area	≥16 years	139 (40.3)	148 (42.9)
Perceived LF as a health risk	No	63 (18.3)	39 (11.3)
Teretived Li as a nearth risk	Yes	282 (81.7)	306 (88.7)
Overall knowledge of LF (symptoms, transmission, and prevention mechanisms)	Knowledgeable	166 (48.1)	214 (62)
- Coveran knowledge of Er (Symptoms, transmission, and prevention meenanisms)	Not knowledgeable	179 (51.9)	131 (38)
Having LLITNs	No	86 (24.9)	75 (21.7)
Traving ELITIVS	Yes	259 (75.1)	270 (78.3)
Use of LLITNs ($n = 529$; 258 cases and 271 controls)	No	42 (16.2)	22 (8.1)
OSC OF ELETTIVS $(n-32)$, 230 cases and 271 controls)	Yes	217 (84.8)	248 (91.9)
Cotting adequate information on the CDTIA program	No	126 (36.5)	119 (34.5)
Getting adequate information on the CDTIA program	Yes	219 (63.5)	226 (65.5)
Using radio as the main source of information on CDTIA	No	338 (98)	334 (96.8)
Using radio as the main source of information on CDTIA	Yes	7 (2)	11 (3.2)
Using television as the main secures of information on CDTIA	No	343 (99.4)	338 (98)
Using television as the main source of information on CDTIA	Yes	2 (0.6)	7 (2)
Using CDDs as the main source of information on CDTIA	No	185 (53.6)	175 (50.7)
Using CDDs as the main source of information on CDTIA	Yes	160 (46.4)	170 (49.3
Using HEWs as the main source of information on CDTIA	No	243 (70.4)	250 (72.5)
Using HEWs as the main source of information on CDTIA	Yes	102 (29.6)	95 (27.5)
	CDDs	153 (44.3)	187 (54.2)
Preference to take treatments	HEWs	155 (44.9)	125 (36.2)
	HWs	37 (10.7)	33 (9.6)
If CDDs $(n = 340)$	Female	88 (57.1)	138 (74.2)
11 CDDs (n = 540)	Male	66 (42.9)	48 (25.8)
Experience of drugs side effects	No	285 (82.6)	313 (91)
Experience of drugs side effects	Yes	60 (17.4)	31 (9)
The perceived conscity of CDDs to distribute drugs	No	178 (51.6)	142 (41.2)
The perceived capacity of CDDs to distribute drugs	Yes	167 (48.4)	203 (58.8)
Participation during CDDs selection	No	283 (82)	205 (59.4)
Participation during CDDs selection	Yes	62 (18)	140 (40.6)
Foor of dwar side effects	No	315 (91.3)	332 (96.2)
Fear of drug side effects	Yes	30 (8.7)	13 (3.8)

LLITNs, long-lasting insecticide-treated nets; CDDs, community drug distributors, CDTIA, community-directed treatment with ivermectin and albendazole; HEWs, health extension workers.

Table 3: Multivariable logistic regression analysis results of the factors for noncompliance to preventive MDA using ivermectin-with-albendazole for the elimination of lymphatic filariasis in Northwest Ethiopia (n = 690).

V	ariables	Cases n = 345	Control $n = 345$	COR (95% CI)	AOR (95% CI)
Age	<30	206	162	1.67 (1.24–2.26)	1.60 (1.10-2.33)*
	≥30	139	183	1	
	Male	122	170	1	_
Gender	Female	223	175	1.78 (1.42–3.06)	1.56 (1.24–3.93)*
Religion	Orthodox	323	325	0.90 (0.48-1.69)	1.17 (0.48-2.86)
	Muslim	22	20	1	

Table 3: Continued.

Completed educational level Read and write only 62 53 1.25 1.25 1.05	Variable	es	Cases $n = 345$	Control $n = 345$	COR (95% CI)	AOR (95% CI)
Completed educational level Primary school (grade 1-8) 45 45 1.08 0.71 (0 0.50		Do not read and write	193	199	(0.66-1.63)	1.03 (0.54–1.97)
Primary school (grade 1 – 8) 45 45 (1.66 – 1.21) 0.71 (0	mpleted educational level	Read and write only	62	53	(0.72-2.16)	1.14 (0.55–2.36)
Marital status Married Marr	Aprilia cuucuttoimi totta	Primary school (grade 1-8)	45	45		0.71 (0.34–1.48)
Married Summarried 108 102 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			45	48		
Community distributors Community of CDDs CDD	rital status	Married	237	243		0.79 (0.50–1.26)
Parmers 215 215 0.545-1.35 0.57 0.57 0.57 Cocupation Employed 49 52 1.08 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.039-1.72 0.61 0.09 Student 42 48 1 1 1 1 1 Gender of HH head Female 293 297 0.91 0.66 0.06 1.39 0.73	Trai status	Unmarried	108	102		(0.30 1.20)
Occupation Employed 49 52 (0.53-2.19) (0.41) (0.41) Unemployed 39 30 (0.82) (0.39-1.72) (0.61) 0.61 (0.39-1.72) 0.61 (0.39-1.72) 0.61 (0.39-1.72) 0.61 (0.39-1.72) 0.61 (0.39-1.72) 0.61 (0.39-1.72) 0.61 (0.39-1.72) 0.67 (0.60-1.39) 0.76 (0.60-1.39) 0.76 (0.60-1.39) 0.76 (0.60-1.39) 0.76 (0.60-1.39) 0.73 (0.60-1.21) 0.73 (0.60-1.21) 0.73 (0.60-1.21) 0.73 (0.60-1.21) 0.73 (0.60-1.21) 0.73 (0.60-1.21) 0.73 (0.60-1.21) 0.73 (0.60-1.21) 0.73 (0.60-1.21) 0.73 (0.60-1.21) 0.73 (0.60-1.21) 0.73		Farmers	215	215		0.57 (0.27–1.21)
Student 42 48 1 0.39-1.72 0.61 (0 1.09 1.09 0.91 0.60 (0.39-1.72 0.61 (0 1.09 0.91 0.60 (0.60-1.39 0.76 (0 1.09 0.60 (0.60-1.39 0.76 (0 1.09 0.60 (0.60-1.39 0.76 (0 1.09 0.60 (0.60-1.39 0.78 (0.60-1.39 0.78 (0.60-1.39 0.78 (0.60-1.39 0.78 (0.60-1.39 0.78 (0.60-1.51 0.78 (0.60-1.22 0.60 (0.6	cupation	Employed	49	52	(0.53-2.19)	0.96 (0.41-2.22)
Gender of HH head Female 293 297 0.91 (0.60-1.39) (0.66-1.39) 0.76 (0.60-1.39) 0.76 (0.60-1.39) 0.76 (0.60-1.39) 0.76 (0.60-1.39) 0.76 (0.60-1.39) 0.76 (0.60-1.39) 0.76 (0.60-1.39) 0.76 (0.60-1.39) 0.76 (0.60-1.39) 0.76 (0.60-1.39) 0.76 (0.60-1.39) 0.73 (0.73 (0.73 (0.60-1.22)) 0.73 (0.60-1.22) 0.73 (0.60-1.22) 0.73 (0.60-1.22) 0.60 (0.60-1.22) 0.06 (0.66-1.22) 0.07 (0.66-1.22) 0.07 (0.66-1.22) 0.07 (0.66-1.22) 0.07 (0.66-1.22) 0.07 (0.75 (0.65-1.21) 0.07 (0.67 (0.66-1.22) 0.07 (0.67 (0.66-1.22) 0.07 (0.67 (0.66-1.22) 0.07 (0.67 (0.66-1.22) 0.07 (0.67 (0.66-1.22) 0.07 (0.67 (0.66-1.22) </td <td></td> <td>Unemployed</td> <td>39</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> <td>0.61 (0.25-1.51)</td>		Unemployed	39	30		0.61 (0.25-1.51)
Gender of HH head Female 293 297 (0.60-1.39) 0.76 (0 Male 52 48 1 1.09 0.73 (0 0.78-1.51) 0.73 (0 Area of residence Rural 245 239 1.09 0.73 (0 0.78 (0.66-1.51) 0.73 (0 Duration of stay in the endemic area <16 years		Student	42	48		
Area of residence Rural 245 239 1.09 (0.78-1.51) 0.73 (0.78-1.51) Duration of stay in the endemic area <16 years	oder of HH head	Female	293	297		0.76 (0.52-1.11)
Area of residence Rural 245 239 (0.78-1.51) 0.73 (0.78	ider of fift nead	Male	52	48		
Urban 100 106 1 Duration of stay in the endemic area <16 years	ea of residence	Rural	245	239		0.73 (0.44-1.21)
Duration of stay in the endemic area < 16 years 206 197 (0.66-1.22) (0.66 ≥16 years 139 148 1 1 1 1 Thought of being susceptible to LF No 63 39 1.75 2 2 (1.80 1 1.80 1 1 1.66 1 1 1 1.66 1 1 1.176 1 1 1.38 1 1.176 1 1 1.38 1 1.19 1 1 1.19 1 1 1.19 1 1 1.19 1 1 1.19 1 1 1 1.19 1 1 1 1.19 1 1 1 1.19 1 1 1 1.19 1 1 1 1.19 1		Urban	100	106		
≥16 years 139 148 1	ration of stay in the endemic area	<16 years	206	197		0.89 (0.60-1.34)
Thought of being susceptible to LF Yes 282 306 1 Having adequate knowledge of LF No 179 131 1.76 1 (1.42-3.77) (1.38 No 179 131 1.76 1 (1.42-3.77) (1.38 1.39 Having adequate knowledge of LF Yes 166 214 1 No 86 75 1.19 1 (0.84-1.70) (0.75 Yes 259 270 1 Use of LLITNS (n = 529) Yes 217 248 1 Home to home 180 169 1 Central 149 157 0.89 0.89 0 0.89 0 0.65-1.21) 0.55 Community distributors 2 6 0.31 0.046-2.21) 0.55 Community distributors 2 6 0.062-1.57) Preferred drug dispenser CDDs 153 187 1.49 1 Fear of drug side effects Yes 30 13 2.43 2 (1.21-4.80) 1.23 1.52 1.56 1.60 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.5	ration of stay in the endenne area	≥16 years	139	148		(0.00-1.54)
Yes 282 306 1	ought of being susceptible to LF	No	63	39		2.36 (1.80-4.32)*
Having adequate knowledge of LF Yes 166 214 1 No 86 75 1.19 1.19 1.19 1.19 1.19 1.19 1.19 1.1		Yes	282	306	1	
Having LLITNs No 86 75 $\frac{1.19}{(0.84-1.70)}$ 1.19 1.20 1.52 116 0.75 1.19 1.19 1.19 1.19 1.19 1.19 1.19 1.1	ving adequate knowledge of LF	No	179	131		1.88 (1.38-3.81)*
Having LLITNs Yes 259 270 1 No 42 22 (1.26-2.77) (1.18 2 1.218 2 (1.26-2.77) (1.18 Yes 217 248 1 Home to home 180 169 1 0.89 (0.65-1.21) (0.55 (0.46-2.21) (0.55 (0.46-2.21) (0.55 Community distributors 2 6 0.31 (0.62-1.57) 0.25 (0.62-1.57) Preferred drug dispenser CDDs 153 187 1.49 1 100 (0.71 1.10-2.01) (0.71 1.10-2.01) (0.71 1.10-2.01) (0.71 1.10-2.01) 1.10-2.01 (0.71 1.10-2.01) 1.10-2.01 1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Yes	166	214		
Use of LLITNs $(n = 529)$ No 42 22 2.18 (1.26-2.77) (1.18 Yes 217 248 1 Home to home 180 169 1 Central 149 157 0.89 (0.65-1.21) (0.58 (0.65-1.21) (0.58 (0.65-1.21) (0.58 (0.65-1.21) (0.58 (0.62-1.57) (0.58 (0.62-1.57) (0.58 (0.62-1.57) (0.59	ving LLITNs	No	86	75		1.08 (0.75–1.58)
Vise of LLITNs (n = 529) No		Yes	259	270		2.12
Home to home	e of LLITNs $(n = 529)$	No	42	22		2.13 (1.18–3.83)*
Central 149 157 0.89 0.05						
Preferred mode of drug delivery Health facility 16 19 1.01 0.58						0.78
Community distributors 2 6 0.31 (0.62-1.57) 0.25 (0.62-1.57)	C 1 1 . C 1 1.1	Central	149	157	(0.65-1.21)	(0.58-1.38)
Community distributors 2 6 (0.62-1.57) 0.25 (Preferred drug dispenser CDDs 153 187 (1.10-2.01) (0.71 Health professional 192 158 1 No 315 332 1 Fear of drug side effects Yes 30 13 2.43 2 (1.21-4.80) (1.23	terred mode of drug delivery	Health facility	16	19		0.92 (0.55–2.12)
Preferred drug dispenser CDDs		Community distributors	2	6		0.25 (0.4–1.2)
Health professional 192 158 1 No 315 332 1 Fear of drug side effects Yes 30 13 $\frac{2.43}{(1.21-4.80)}$ 2 The preceived constitute of CDDs to No 178 143 $\frac{1.52}{1.52}$ 116 (0	ferred drug dispenser	CDDs	153	187		1.06 (0.71–1.59)
Fear of drug side effects $\frac{2.43}{(1.21-4.80)}$ $\frac{2.43}{(1.21-4.80)}$ $\frac{2.43}{(1.21-4.80)}$ $\frac{2.43}{(1.21-4.80)}$ $\frac{2.43}{(1.21-4.80)}$ $\frac{2.43}{(1.21-4.80)}$ $\frac{2.43}{(1.21-4.80)}$ $\frac{2.43}{(1.21-4.80)}$ $\frac{2.43}{(1.21-4.80)}$	O .1	Health professional	192	158		
The persoived constitute of CDDs to No. 178 142 1.52 1.16 (0.	Fear of drug side effects	No	315	332		2.45
The perceived conscitute of CDDs to No. 170 142		Yes	30	13		2.45 (1.23–4.86)*
	The perceived capacity of CDDs to distribute drugs	No	178	142	1.52 (1.13–2.06)	1.16 (0.77–1.74)
Yes 167 203 1		Yes	167	203		
	ticipation in CDDs selection	No	283	205	3.12 (2.2-4.42)	2.58 (1.70-3.91)*
Yes 62 140 1		Yes	62	140	1	

ownership, leading to improved treatment compliance. Thus, stakeholders should conduct a customized prior community mobilization campaign to increase community participation during MDA drug distributors' selection thereby reducing MDA noncompliance.

4.1. Strengths and Limitations of the Study. This study has several strengths such as being a community-based study and training of data collectors with practical exercises among others. However, since the selection of cases and controls entirely depends on the CDTI registration book, this study could be subjected to selection bias. Also, though we made considerable efforts to decrease the possibility of bias in this study, recall biases could be another potential limitation for a survey of this kind.

5. Conclusions

Noncompliance with LF preventive MDA therapy was associated with specific demographic, individual recipient, program, and drug delivery characteristics. Age, gender, risk perception, disease knowledge, LLITN utilization, fear of drug side effects, and participation during CDD selection were found to be the major factors significantly associated with noncompliance with preventive MDA using ivermectin-with-albendazole for the elimination of LF. This finding has important implications for the MDA program's effectiveness and can be used to accelerate the elimination of lymphatic filariasis in the study area and other endemic settings. In particular, stakeholders should implement integrated and tailored interventions to improve MDA compliance through raising awareness and increasing community participation during MDA drug distributors' selection. From a future research point of view, conducting further in-depth interviews using a qualitative research method is essential to better understanding the reasons for noncompliance despite having good disease awareness.

Abbreviations

ALB: Albendazole

AOR: Adjusted odds ratio

CDD: Community drug distributor

CDTIA: Community-directed treatment with ivermectin

and albendazole

CI: Confidence interval COR: Crude odds ratio

DALYs: Disability-adjusted life years

FMoH: Federal Ministry of Health of Ethiopia

GPELF: Global program to eliminate lymphatic filariasis

HEW: Health extension worker

IVM: Ivermectin

LF: Lymphatic filariasis

LLITN: Long-lasting insecticide-treated net LMICs: Low- and middle-income countries

MDA: Mass drug administration NTD: Neglected tropical diseases

SSA: Sub-Saharan Africa

WHO: World Health Organization WoHO: Woreda health office.

Data Availability

The data supporting the current study are available from the corresponding author upon request.

Ethical Approval

Ethical clearance was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Bahir Dar University, CMHS, Amhara Public Health Institute, Awi Zone Health Department, and Jawi District health office before the data collection process started. The study participants were informed about the purpose of the study and the importance of their participation in the study.

Consent

Verbal consent and assent were taken from each respondent. Also, the study subjects were informed that they can skip questions that they do not want to answer fully or partly and also that they can stop the interviewing process at any time as per their will. Each respondent was informed that the information provided by them is kept confidential and is used only for research purposes.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Authors' Contributions

FM was the principal investigator of the study and took the leading responsibility starting from the origin, design, and supervising data collection process to the final analysis and preparation of the manuscript. GT, MB, and MMA contributed in supervising the study, reviewing the document, and providing critical comments from the design and data collection process to the final analysis and preparation of the manuscript. Also, all authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the School of Public Health and the College of Medicine and Health Sciences at Bahir Dar University. Also, the authors would like to express their gratitude to the Carter Center Ethiopia Bahir Dar Regional Project Office and Awi Zone Health Departments. Finally, the authors would like to extend their gratitude to health extension workers, field data collectors, supervisors as well as study participants. This research project was financially supported by Bahir Dar University through the postgraduate research funding scheme. The funder played no role in the conception, methodology, and interpretation of data or in the reporting of this study.

References

- [1] J. A. Carvalho, J. Rodgers, J. Atouguia, D. M. Prazeres, and G. A. Monteiro, "DNA vaccines: a rational design against parasitic diseases," *Expert Review of Vaccines*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 175–191, 2010.
- [2] L. M. Gedge, A. A. Bettis, M. H. Bradley, T. D. Hollingsworth, and H. C. Turner, "Economic evaluations of lymphatic filariasis interventions: a systematic review and research needs," *Parasites & Vectors*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 75–18, 2018.
- [3] M. J. Bockarie, E. M. Pedersen, G. B. White, and E. Michael, "Role of vector control in the global program to eliminate lymphatic filariasis," *Annual Review of Entomology*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 469–487, 2009.
- [4] World Health Organization, Guideline: Alternative Mass Drug Administration Regimens to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 2017.
- [5] W. K. Redekop, E. J. Lenk, M. Luyendijk et al., "The socioeconomic benefit to individuals of achieving the 2020 targets for five preventive chemotherapy neglected tropical diseases," *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, vol. 11, no. 1, Article ID e0005289, 2017.
- [6] K. Deribe, K. Meribo, T. Gebre et al., "The burden of neglected tropical diseases in Ethiopia, and opportunities for integrated control and elimination," *Parasites & Vectors*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 240–315, 2012.
- [7] S. M. Upadhyayula, S. R. Mutheneni, M. R. Kadiri, S. Kumaraswamy, and B. Nagalla, "A cohort study of lymphatic filariasis on socio economic conditions in Andhra Pradesh, India," *PLoS One*, vol. 7, no. 3, Article ID e33779, 2012.
- [8] S. Wynd, W. D. Melrose, D. N. Durrheim, J. Carron, and M. Gyapong, "Understanding the community impact of lymphatic filariasis: a review of the sociocultural literature," *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, vol. 85, no. 6, pp. 493–498, 2007.
- [9] O. A. Eneanya, T. Garske, and C. A. Donnelly, "The social, physical and economic impact of lymphedema and hydrocele: a matched cross-sectional study in rural Nigeria," *BMC Infectious Diseases*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 332–416, 2019.
- [10] World Health Organization, Global Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis: Managing Morbidity and Preventing Disability, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 2013.
- [11] A. T. van 't Noordende, M. W. Aycheh, and A. Schippers, "The impact of leprosy, podoconiosis and lymphatic filariasis on family quality of life: a qualitative study in northwest Ethiopia," *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, vol. 14, no. 3, Article ID e0008173, 2020.
- [12] GBD 2017 DALYs and HALE Collaborators, "Global, regional, and national disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs) for 359 diseases and injuries and healthy life expectancy (HALE) for 195 countries and territories, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017," *Lancet (London, England)*, vol. 392, no. 10159, pp. 1859–1922, 2018.
- [13] World Health Organization, "Lymphatic filariasis Key facts [Internet]," 2022, https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/lymphatic-filariasis.
- [14] K. Deribe, S. J. Brooker, R. L. Pullan et al., "Epidemiology and individual, household and geographical risk factors of podoconiosis in Ethiopia: results from the first nationwide mapping," *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, vol. 92, no. 1, pp. 148–158, 2015.

- [15] K. Deribe, S. Tomczyk, and F. Tekola-Ayele, "Ten years of podoconiosis research in Ethiopia," *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, vol. 7, no. 10, Article ID e2301, 2013.
- [16] A. Boyd, K. Y. Won, S. K. McClintock et al., "A community-based study of factors associated with continuing transmission of lymphatic filariasis in Leogane, Haiti," *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, vol. 4, no. 3, p. e640, 2010.
- [17] World Health Organization, Assessing the Epidemiology of Soil-Transmitted Helminths during a Transmission Assessment Survey in the Global Programme for the Elimination of Lymphatic Filariasis, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 2015.
- [18] J. O. Gyapong, I. O. Owusu, F. B. da-Costa Vroom, E. O. Mensah, and M. Gyapong, "Elimination of lymphatic filariasis: current perspectives on mass drug administration," *Research and Reports in Tropical Medicine*, vol. 9, pp. 25–33, 2018
- [19] NTD Modelling Consortium Lymphatic Filariasis Group, "The roadmap towards elimination of lymphatic filariasis by 2030: insights from quantitative and mathematical modelling," *Gates open research*, vol. 3, p. 1538, 2019.
- [20] World Health Organization, "Global programme to eliminate lymphatic filariasis: progress report on mass drug administration in 2009," Weekly Epidemiological Record= Relevé Épidémiologique Hebdomadaire, vol. 85, no. 38, pp. 365–372, 2010
- [21] B. Mengistu, K. Deribe, F. Kebede et al., "The national programme to eliminate lymphatic filariasis from Ethiopia," *Ethiopian Medical Journal*, vol. 55, no. Suppl 1, pp. 45–54, 2017
- [22] M. P Rebollo, H. Sime, A. Assefa et al., "Shrinking the lymphatic filariasis map of Ethiopia: reassessing the population at risk through nationwide mapping," *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, vol. 9, no. 11, Article ID e0004172, 2015.
- [23] N. K. Biritwum, P. Yikpotey, B. K. Marfo et al., "Persistent 'hotspots' of lymphatic filariasis microfilaraemia despite 14 years of mass drug administration in Ghana," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, vol. 110, no. 12, pp. 690–695, 2016.
- [24] C. Jones, B. Ngasala, Y. A. Derua et al., "Lymphatic filariasis transmission in Rufiji District, southeastern Tanzania: infection status of the human population and mosquito vectors after twelve rounds of mass drug administration," *Parasites & Vectors*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 588–8, 2018.
- [25] H. Sime, K. M. Gass, S. Mekasha et al., "Results of a confirmatory mapping tool for Lymphatic filariasis endemicity classification in areas where transmission was uncertain in Ethiopia," PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases, vol. 12, no. 3, Article ID e0006325, 2018.
- [26] A. Teshome, M. A. Asfaw, C. Churko et al., "Coverage Validation survey for lymphatic filariasis treatment in itang special district of gambella regional state of Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study," *Infection and Drug Resistance*, vol. 14, pp. 1537–1543, 2021.
- [27] B. V. Babu and G. R. Babu, "Coverage of, and compliance with, mass drug administration under the programme to eliminate lymphatic filariasis in India: a systematic review," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, vol. 108, no. 9, pp. 538–549, 2014.
- [28] D. K. de Souza, K. Gass, J. Otchere et al., "Review of MDA registers for lymphatic filariasis: findings, and potential uses in addressing the endgame elimination challenges," PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases, vol. 14, no. 5, Article ID e0008306, 2020.

- [29] E. T. Lupenza, D. B. Gasarasi, and O. M. Minzi, "Lymphatic filariasis elimination status: wuchereria bancrofti infections in human populations and factors contributing to continued transmission after seven rounds of mass drug administration in Masasi district, Tanzania," *PLoS One*, vol. 17, no. 1, Article ID e0262693, 2022.
- [30] A. K. Manyeh, L. Ibisomi, R. Ramaswamy, F. Baiden, and T. Chirwa, "Exploring factors affecting quality implementation of lymphatic filariasis mass drug administration in Bole and central Gonja districts in northern Ghana," PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases, vol. 14, no. 8, Article ID e0007009, 2020.
- [31] D. Yirga, K. Deribe, K. Woldemichael, M. Wondafrash, and W. Kassahun, "Factors associated with compliance with community directed treatment with ivermectin for onchocerciasis control in southwestern Ethiopia," *Parasites & Vectors*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 48–10, 2010.
- [32] T. Endeshaw, A. Taye, Z. Tadesse et al., "Presence of Wuchereria bancrofti microfilaremia despite 7 years of annual ivermectin monotherapy mass drug administration for onchocerciasis control: a study in north-west Ethiopia," *Pathogens and Global Health*, vol. 109, no. 7, pp. 344–351, 2015.
- [33] C. A. Torres-Vitolas, N. Dhanani, and F. M. Fleming, "Factors affecting the uptake of preventive chemotherapy treatment for schistosomiasis in Sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review," *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, vol. 15, no. 1, Article ID e0009017, 2021.
- [34] F. Ayalew, D. D. Atnafu, M. Bedimo, and K. Mulatu, "Determinants of community-led ivermectin treatment adherence for onchocerciasis control in western Ethiopia: a case-control study," *Tropical Medicine and Health*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 22–28, 2020.
- [35] W. J. Kisoka, P. E. Simonsen, M. N. Malecela, B. P. Tersbøl, D. L. Mushi, and D. W. Meyrowitsch, "Factors influencing drug uptake during mass drug administration for control of lymphatic filariasis in rural and urban Tanzania," *PLoS One*, vol. 9, no. 10, Article ID e109316, 2014.
- [36] A. Krentel, P. U. Fischer, and G. J. Weil, "A review of factors that influence individual compliance with mass drug administration for elimination of lymphatic filariasis," PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases, vol. 7, no. 11, Article ID e2447, 2013.
- [37] A. Krentel and K. Wellings, "The role of gender relations in uptake of mass drug administration for lymphatic filariasis in Alor District, Indonesia," *Parasites & Vectors*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 179–211, 2018.
- [38] I. Dicko, Y. I. Coulibaly, M. Sangaré, B. Sarfo, and P. A. Nortey, "Non-compliance to mass drug administration associated with the low perception of the community members about their susceptibility to lymphatic filariasis in Ankobra, Ghana," *Infectious Disorders: Drug Targets*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 167–174, 2020.
- [39] M. L. E. Amarillo, V. Y. Belizario, J. T. Sadiang-Abay, S. A. M. Sison, and A. M. S. Dayag, "Factors associated with the acceptance of mass drug administration for the elimination of lymphatic filariasis in Agusan del Sur, Philippines," *Parasites & Vectors*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 14–12, 2008.
- [40] N.-K. Biritwum, B. Garshong, B. Alomatu, D. K. de Souza, M. Gyapong, and D. Kyelem, "Improving drug delivery strategies for lymphatic filariasis elimination in urban areas in Ghana," *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, vol. 11, no. 5, Article ID e0005619, 2017.
- [41] M. V. Weerasooriya, C. T. Yahathugoda, D. Wickramasinghe et al., "Social mobilisation, drug coverage and compliance and

- adverse reactions in a mass drug administration (MDA) programme for the elimination of lymphatic filariasis in Sri Lanka," *Filaria Journal*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 11–10, 2007.
- [42] C. S. K. Ahorlu, E. Koka, S. Adu-Amankwah, J. Otchere, and D. K. de Souza, "Community perspectives on persistent transmission of lymphatic filariasis in three hotspot districts in Ghana after 15 rounds of mass drug administration: a qualitative assessment," *BMC Public Health*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 238–310, 2018.
- [43] M. A. Hussain, A. K. Sitha, S. Swain, S. Kadam, and S. Pati, "Mass drug administration for lymphatic filariasis elimination in a coastal state of India: a study on barriers to coverage and compliance," *Infectious diseases of poverty*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 31–38, 2014.
- [44] D. W. Njomo, M. Amuyunzu-Nyamongo, J. K. Magambo, and S. M. Njenga, "The role of personal opinions and experiences in compliance with mass drug administration for lymphatic filariasis elimination in Kenya," *PLoS One*, vol. 7, no. 11, Article ID e48395, 2012.